

**CENTRAL ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION  
NEW DELHI**

**Petition No. 88/TT/2017**

- Subject : Petition for determination of transmission tariff for 2014-15 to 2018-19 of eleven transmission lines belonging to MPPTCL conveying electricity as ISTS lines, for inclusion in computation of Point of Connection charges in accordance with the 2014 Tariff Regulations and (Sharing of Inter-State Transmission Charges and Losses), Regulations, 2010.
- Date of Hearing : 3.8.2017
- Coram : Shri Gireesh B. Pradhan, Chairperson  
Shri A. K. Singhal, Member  
Shri A.S. Bakshi, Member  
Dr. M. K. Iyer, Member
- Petitioner : Madhya Pradesh Power Transmission Company Limited (MPPTCL)
- Respondents : Power Grid Corporation of India Limited (PGCIL) and 5 others
- Parties present : Shri G. Umapathy, Advocate, MPPTCL  
Shri Aditya Singh, Advocate, MPPTCL  
Shri Abhinava Anand, MPPTCL  
Shri Har Mohan Gupta, MPPTCL  
Shri Pardeep Mishra, Advocate, RRVPNL  
Shri Manoj Kumar Sharma, Advocate, RRVPNL

**Record of Proceedings**

Learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the Commission vide order dated 15.10.2015 in Petition No. 217/TT/2013 approved annual transmission charges of nine transmission lines for the period from 1.7.2011 to 31.3.2014. Tariff for 400 kV Seoni (MP)-Sarni (MP) Line and 400 kV Seoni (MP)-Bhilai (Chhattisgarh) lines was not granted as they were not certified by WRPC. Now, WRPC has certified these lines as deemed ISTS lines. Accordingly, tariff for all the eleven deemed ISTS lines may be allowed in



the instant petition. He submitted that tariff for the portion of these lines falling in the State of MP and owned by MPPTCL is only claimed in the instant petition. He further submitted that for determining the cost of these lines, proportionate cost of line is taken in the ratio of line length in the State and the portion under the ownership of other State will be dealt by the concerned State.

2. Learned counsel for RRVPNL submitted that in between Bhadod to Modak transmission line, the petitioner constructed one more intra-state sub-station in Bhanpura which has been commissioned during last year. Hence, the petitioner is entitled for transmission charges from Bhanpura to the border (i.e. border of Madhya Pradesh and Rajasthan) not from Bhadod to border. Accordingly, the petitioner's claim may be curtailed from Bhanpura to the border. He further submitted that a detailed reply on behalf of RRVPNL will be filed. Learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that they would clarify the same on receipt of the reply from RRVPNL.

3. The Commission directed the respondents to file their reply by 25.8.2017 and the petitioner to file rejoinder, if any, by 8.9.2017. The Commission directed the parties to comply with the directions within the specified timeline and further observed that no extension of time shall be granted.

4. Subject to the above, order in the petition was reserved.

By order of the Commission

Sd/-  
(T. Rout)  
Chief (Law)

